

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/585,821	OGAWA, YUICHIRO	
	Examiner MARTIN ROGERS	Art Unit 1791	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Martin Rogers

(3) _____

(2) Michael Steger

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 14 September 2010.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Panning (Pre-Grant Publication 2005/0028915), Hirai et al (Pre-Grant Publication 2004/0013754), Trares et al (USP 5524688), and Welch (USP 522814).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/MARTIN ROGERS/ Examiner, Art Unit 1791	
--	--

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Steger argued that Panning and Hirai were not combinable in the manner required by the office action. The examiner disagreed and stated the motivation that a skilled artisan would have had to combine the references was present in the original rejection. No agreement was reached.